UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,782	12/08/2000	Tuan Tran	80168.0231	1182

32658 7590 04/05/2004

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER	
LAZARO, DAVID R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	6

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/731,782	TRAN, TUAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Lazaro	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 March 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Papers Received

2. Preliminary Amendment and Drawings received 03/23/01.

3. Change of Address was received on 01/27/03.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 3, 390. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,237,035 by Himmel et al. (Himmel).

7. With respect to Claim 1, Himmel teaches a method for selectively disabling resubmission of an HTTP request (Col. 2 lines 27-33) comprising: receiving input relating to a functional group (Col. 3 lines 63-66 and Col. 4 lines 51-63), wherein a functional group comprises two input controls (Col. 4 lines 1-19); determining whether a member of the functional group has been previously activated (Col. 5 lines 3-22 and lines 30-37); and when a member of the functional group has been previously activated, selectively disabling the resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 5 lines 30-37).

8. With respect to Claim 2, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches when no member of the functional group has been previously activated, updating a data store to indicate that a member of the functional group has been previously activated and then submitting the HTTP request (Col. 5 lines 30-37).

9. With respect to Claim 7, Himmel teaches a method for selectively disabling resubmission of an HTTP request (Col. 2 lines 27-33) comprising; receiving a first web page comprising a function group (Col. 3 line 63 – Col. 4 line 19) receiving input relating

to a member of the functional group (Col. 4 lines 51-63); submitting a response based on the received input relating to the member of the function group (Col. 5 lines 30-37); selectively diabling resubmission of an HTTP request by disabling a submission capability for each of the members of the function group (Col. 5 lines 3-22 and lines 30-37).

10. With respect to Claim 8, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches receiving a second web page in response to the submission of the first web page (Col. 1 lines 61-65); receiving input relating to a back function (Col. 1 lines 61-65); redisplaying the web page on a network device (Col. 1 lines 61-65); and rendering the first web page from a cache associated with the network device (inherent in browser capability Col. 4 lines 20-23).

11. With respect to Claim 10, Himmel teaches a network device for selectively disabling resubmission of an http request (Col. 2 lines 27-33) comprising: a network communication interface configured to receive a web page (Col. 3 lines 35-49) comprising a plurality of input controls from a network, wherein at least two of the plurality of input controls are group members of a functional group (Col. 3 line 63 – Col. 4 line 19); an input device configured to receive user input relating to resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 3 lines 35-49 and lines 63-66); and a processor configured to selectively disable resubmission of the HTTP request when a functional group member has been previously submitted (Col. 3 lines 34-59 and Col. 5 lines 30-37).

12. With respect to Claim 15, Himmel teaches a system for selectively disabling resubmission of an HTTP request (Col. 2 lines 27-33) comprising: a network

communication interface configured to receive a web page (Col. 3 lines 35-49) comprising a plurality of input controls from a network, wherein at least two of the plurality of input controls are group members of a functional group (Col. 3 line 63 – Col. 4 line 19); input device means configured to receive user input relating to resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 3 lines 35-49 and lines 63-66); processor means configured to selectively disable resubmission of the HTTP request when a functional group member has been previously submitted (Col. 3 lines 34-59 and Col. 5 lines 30-37).

13. With respect to Claim 16, Himmel teaches a computer program product, comprising a computer readable medium having computer code embodied therein for selectively disabling resubmission of an HTTP request (Col. 2 lines 27-33) comprising: computer readable program code devices configured as a network communication interface configured to receive a web page (Col. 3 lines 35-49) comprising a plurality of input controls from a network, wherein at least two of the plurality of input controls are group members of a functional group (Col. 3 line 63 – Col. 4 line 19); computer readable program code devices configured to receive user input relating to resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 3 lines 35-49 and lines 63-66); computer readable program code devices configured to selectively disable resubmission of the HTTP request when a functional group member has been previously submitted (Col. 3 lines 34-59 and Col. 5 lines 30-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 3-6, 9 and 11-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of U.S. Patent 6,535,883 by Lee et al. (Lee).

16. With respect to Claim 3, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches a displaying a message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506). Himmel does not explicitly disclose the use of a confirmation attribute value having a first value to display the message and include a control to enable resubmission of the HTTP request. Lee teaches an attribute value can be set to a first value such that a message will include a control to enable a normally disabled submission (Col. 8 lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Himmel and modify it as indicated by Lee such that the act of selectively disabling the resubmission of the HTTP request comprises: determining a confirmation attribute value; and when the confirmation attribute has a first value, selectively displaying a first message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted and including a control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request. One would be motivated to have this as it is a simple, user-friendly way to provide submission rules (Col. 2 lines 55-58 of Lee).

17. With respect to Claim 4, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches a displaying a message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506). Himmel does not explicitly disclose the use of a

confirmation attribute value having a second value to display the message and including no control to enable resubmission of the HTTP request. Lee teaches an attribute value can be set to a second value such that a message will not include a control to enable a normally disabled submission (Col. 8 lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Himmel and modify it as indicated by Lee such that the act of selectively disabling the resubmission of the HTTP request comprises: determining a confirmation attribute value; and when the confirmation attribute has a second value, selectively displaying a second message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted and including no control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request. One would be motivated to have this as it is a simple, user-friendly way to provide submission rules (Col. 2 lines 55-58 of Lee).

18. With respect to Claim 5, Himmel in view of Lee teaches all the limitations of Claim 4 and further teaches the act of selectively disabling the resubmission of the HTTP request comprises: determining a confirmation attribute value (Col. 8 lines 19-35 of Lee); and when the confirmation attribute has a first value (Col. 8 lines 19-35 of Lee), selectively displaying a first message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506 of Himmel) and including a control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 8 lines 19-35 of Lee).

19. With respect to Claim 6, Himmel in view of Lee teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches the act of selectively disabling the resubmission of the HTTP request further comprises: determining an input value provided in response to the

first message; and when the input value is affirmative, resubmitting the HTTP request (Col. 8 lines 19-35 of Lee).

20. With respect to Claim 9, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches receiving input relating to a member of the functional group (Col. 4 lines 51-63) and displaying a message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506). Himmel does not explicitly disclose the use of a confirmation attribute value having either a first value or second value to include or not include respectively, a control to enable resubmission of the HTTP request with the displayed message. Lee teaches an attribute value can be set to a first value such that a message will include a control to enable a normally disabled submission (Col. 8 lines 19-35) or a second value such that a message will not include a control to enable a normally disabled submission (Col. 8 lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Himmel and modify it as indicated by Lee such that the method further comprises determining a confirmation attribute value; when the confirmation attribute has a first value, displaying a first message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted and including a control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request; and when the confirmation attribute has a second value, displaying a second message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted and including no control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request. One would be motivated to have this as it is a simple, user-friendly way to provide submission rules (Col. 2 lines 55-58 of Lee).

21. With respect to Claim 11, Himmel teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 but does not explicitly disclose the processor is additionally configured to allow resubmission when a functional group member has been previously submitted and an affirmative input is received. Lee teaches a submission can be selectively allowed based on an affirmative input even if the submission would not normally be allowed (Col. 8 lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Himmel and modify it as indicated by Lee such that the processor is additionally configured to selectively allow resubmission of the HTTP request when a functional group member has been previously submitted and an affirmative input is received from the input device. One would be motivated to have this as it is a simple, user-friendly way to provide submission rules (Col. 2 lines 55-58 of Lee).

22. With respect to Claim 12, Himmel in view of Lee teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches the processor is configured to cause an output device to display a first message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506 of Himmel) and including a control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 8 lines 33-35 of Lee).

23. With respect to Claim 13, Himmel in view of Lee teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches the processor is additionally configured to cause an output device to display a second message indicating that a related response has been previously submitted (See Fig. 5, 506 of Himmel) and including no control to enable the resubmission of the HTTP request (Col. 8 lines 33-35 of Lee).

24. With respect to Claim 14, Himmel in view of Lee teaches all the limitations of Claim 13 and further teaches the processor is configured to cause the first message to display when a confirmation attribute is set to a first value and the second message to display when the confirmation value is set to a second value (Col. 8 lines 33-35 of Lee).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
March 31, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER